

## Opening

**Clark Kelso**

The meeting was convened at 9:13 a.m. Roll was called

## Special Recognition

**Davood Ghods and Clark Kelso**

A certificate of appreciation was awarded to Cathy Cleek for her leadership in creating the Boomerang database for the state.

A certificate of appreciation was awarded to Carolyn Lawson in recognition of her outstanding efforts and commitment to the eServices Office and her leadership in bringing together the webmasters community.

A certificate of appreciation was awarded to Debra Gonzales for her leadership and commitment in working with the eServices Office to create the Consumer Service Center.

Council members were encouraged to contact Clark Kelso or Davood Ghods if they would like to nominate staff for recognition.

## State CIO Update

**Clark Kelso**

Clark reviewed the [Draft IT Annual Report](#). He thanked Davood Ghods and CDFA for their assistance formatting the document. In the future, the report will be scheduled for release in the fall following the close of the fiscal year. The report recognizes many successful activities from the previous year. In future years, we need to improve our tracking and reporting on completed activities as they are finished. Clark asked CIO's to notify the Office of the State CIO when a project is completed and to report what was accomplished.

The Office of the State CIO (OCIO) will be standing up in January 2008 to implement SB 834 (2006).and SB90 (2007). The office will include 34 positions, including OTROS staff transferring from the Department of Finance (DOF). The Office of Privacy Protection was also created by the SB90 legislation; it will be housed in the State and Consumer Services Agency. An exempt position has been created to oversee the new Office of Information Security and Privacy Protection; SCSA is currently recruiting for that position. Interested CIO's should contact Andrew Armani to nominate themselves or other qualified parties. Clark noted that he anticipates the OCIO will continue to need and rely on volunteers from departments and ITC members for the future IT program.

Accessibility continues to be an issue for state websites. A federal court recently approved for class-action status a lawsuit filed against Target for not making their website fully accessible. When IOUCA completed its work in 2006, it published accessibility recommendations available on the [eServices website](#). The recommendations not mandatory policy, but have been endorsed by the IT Council, the Portal Steering Committee and the Portal Governing Board. However, it should be noted that we still have web content that is not fully accessible. Part of the problem is that much of our material is in PDF format; we have worked with Adobe, but there are still problems making some PDF type documents fully accessible. Accessibility of web content will continue to be an issue for government agencies. A working group sponsored by the Under-Secretaries is being formed to address making all state

websites ADA accessible. The working group will coordinate with IOUCA and others. It is anticipated that accessibility efforts will be fairly resource-intensive for departments.

### State Portal Update

**Andrew Armani**

The November deadline to convert to the new look and feel is almost here. The eServices Office has been receiving a lot of requests for extensions and exemptions. They are communicating with webmasters regarding what is needed to request an extension or exemption. The Office is very busy reviewing and approving new websites using the [checklist](#) available on their website. Note that eServices only reviews and approves the template areas at the top and bottom of the web pages for accessibility; content areas within pages can still be inaccessible.

The Boomerang website is up and running; more than 400 retirees have registered with the site. Starting next month, approximately 20 departments will have access to the database. It will be open to all state agencies in January 2008.

Clark noted that at a recent meeting he attended it was revealed that 70% of current CEA's are eligible for retirement.

### DTS Update

**Mitzi Higashidani for PK Agarwal**

The Ca.gov domain was deleted by the federal government a few weeks ago after a local site with a ca.gov address was hacked and rerouted to an inappropriate site. DTS worked with the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) to have the domain restored before critical functions were interrupted. It was restored within hours. DTS continues to work with GSA to prevent this from happening again. GSA has provided a redraft of their policy document and DTS is reviewing it. The revised policy includes a reminder of our responsibilities in the ca.gov domain. One of the policy statements was that we are not supposed to have any type of private advertisement on ca.gov websites or any links to private websites – this may be an issue because many sites have links to appropriate private sector websites and we want to continue that. Clark will follow up with DTS and GSA. GSA publicly apologized to the State of California for the deletion event.

Melissa Matsuura, DTS' Chief Financial Officer introduced their third rate package. DTS continues to consolidate service offerings and rates. This package is relatively small and should not be as controversial as the last rate change. It consists of six areas:

1. Open-system storage tier 3 and tier-4 storage for fixed data;
2. Computer output microfiche;
3. Disaster recovery;
4. Secure file transfer;
5. Training center; and
6. Zap processor.

The rates for computer output microfiche will be rising as they are aligned with vendor costs and overhead; DTS currently out-sources this service. It was noted that this rate applies only to traditional microfiche, *not* digital. Clark noted that DOJ recently converted their microfiche to digital format; this is an industry trend. Disaster recovery rates will be changing to a flat fee. Secure file transfer rates will be significantly reduced.

Training center rates, never fully recovered by the data center in the past, will be aligned and will include class costs plus overhead. Zap processor rates will be reduced; the Zap processor is a new IBM processor specifically running JAVA workload.

The rate package has been reviewed with the DTS Customer Council and is currently at Agency pending Secretary Marin's approval. Once approved, the rate package will be presented to the Technology Services Board (TSB) for approval. Clark is interested in knowing if the formation of the Customer Council has resolved the process issues that arose with the previous rate package; he encouraged agencies to contact him.

A Council member asked if we consider our current encryption solution to be a permanent security solution or a temporary solution that is likely to be insecure in five years? The State ISO, Colleen, replied we need to be constantly looking at the effectiveness of our encryption as well as security for other media (e.g., mobile devices), other options, security improvements in hardware, encryption improvements, etc. We will be in a continual state of monitoring the market for encryption solutions

Mitzi requested DTS be placed on the next meeting agenda to discuss "DTS 2011: Future Services".

### DOF Budget Update

**Debbie Leibrock**

DOF/OTROS is currently reviewing proposals and looking at fund conditions. Budget and OTROS analysts continue to be available to departments as they prepare for the transition to the Office of the State CIO. Debbie presented an overview of the changes in IT Governance that will occur with enactment of SB 834, SB 90, and Budget Act of 2007 and with the move of OTROS to the OCIO in January 2008. See the presentation, [Changes in IT Governance](#) for details.

SB 834 formally recognized DTS, created the OCIO, and established the State CIO as a cabinet position. SB 90 expanded the OCIO's authorities and responsibilities, created the Office of Information Security and Privacy Protection (OISPP), and provided for projects to be approved by the OCIO and funded through the normal budget process. The legislation is effective January 2008. In addition, the Budget Act of 2007 provided funding for the OCIO and OISPP.

The new governance structure will result in the formation of three new organizations. The Office of the State CIO will be headed by the State CIO, a cabinet-level position. The Office of Information Security and Privacy Protection will be created under the State and Consumer Services Agency. The Information Technology Consulting Unit will be created at Department of Finance to act as a bridge between DOF budget staff and the OCIO and to retain some technology expertise at DOF. OTROS staff performing project review and oversight will be transferred to the OCIO in January 2008.

The OISPP will be a new agency-level office in the SCSA. The Office will have authority to create statewide policy and standards for IT security and privacy for state government. The consumer privacy program will be moved from the Business and Professions Code to Government Code. OTROS staff performing security functions will be transferred to OISPP in January 2008.

The transfer of duties will take time to implement. New working relationships and new processes are being defined now and will be published later this year. Facilities for the new offices will take longer; staff will likely move to the new facilities in Spring 2008.

**Question:** At this time is it business as usual for submitting FSR's, etc?

**Response:** Yes; until January 2008 when the new OCIO is operational.

### FI\$CAL Update

**Sue Bost**

Sue's presentation, [IT Council FI\\$CAL Project Update](#), is available on the CIO website. The Legislature provided \$6.6 million in the 2007-2008 budget for additional FI\$CAL planning. Provisional language was included in the budget to provide direction. The Legislature wants DOF to submit another Special Project Report (SPR) by April 1, 2008; FI\$CAL is currently on target to submit the report early for inclusion in the January 10 Budget. The report will include a minimum of four alternatives – FI\$CAL as approved in December 2006, BIS as approved in 2005, a proof of concept, and maintaining the status quo. At this time, FI\$CAL is targeting final approval of the SPR in December 2007. Once approved, the project team will meet with the departments to review the changes in the new report. In addition, FI\$CAL plans to hold education forums for major stakeholders to help them develop a better understanding of what the environment will be under this new enterprise system.

The provisional language also calls for FI\$CAL to develop a funding and financing plan, to report the status of funding discussions with the federal government, to formalize the roles and responsibilities of the partner agencies participating in the project, to develop Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) with each of the partner agencies participating, develop a plan for leadership succession, and to develop a project oversight plan in conjunction with OTROS and BSA. FI\$CAL has drafted MOU's with DOF, DGS, SCO, and STO; they are awaiting final signatures. It is anticipated that the proposed project oversight plan may be an ongoing request model for large technology projects.

DGS has informed FI\$CAL they are no longer in procurement; they are back in planning. Discussions will focus on information already available to the public so as not to jeopardize the procurement document.

### Strategic Planning Committee

**Carlos Ramos**

The Committee does not have a document for ITC to review and approve. The plan is to take a different approach this year. During last year's budget process, the Legislature indicated that the State IT Strategic Plan didn't provide enough detail about how the projects they were approving through the budget process impacted the plan and that the Plan didn't map projects to the goals. The Legislature wants a better level of specificity in the plan.

The State CIO wants to create a road map showing how specific activities map to IT strategies. The road map should be a dynamic report available through the web rather than a paper report to enable multiple views. A list of projects and activities departments are working on is being developed and with projects and activities mapped to goals in the 2006 Strategic Plan. The Road Map should be updated twice a year, resulting in a more agile and more current information source.

The Committee has identified the data elements needed for the Road Map DOF approved projects reporting. Some information about the projects has been collected and a couple of approaches on how to make the information available online have been identified. Once the system is available, the Committee will schedule a day when

departments can bring a list of their projects with detailed information for entry into the system; this will likely take place at the DTS Training Center. Experts will be available to assist departments in entering the data.

The Committee proposes alternating update of the Strategic Plan with update of the Road Map. This approach has been discussed with and endorsed by members of the Legislature with the understanding that they will need to see the implementation before formally endorsing. Additional information will be posted online and made available to departments as it becomes available.

**Question:** Is there a next step for projects under delegation?

**Response:** Yes, but this will not be done this year.

**Question:** Is there a process for projects that fall across multiple categories?

**Response:** We will be able to categorize projects in multiple categories. The Committee is leaving the decision of what category(s) a project falls into to the departments at this time.

**Comment:** There is concern that if categories are self-set, we will need oversight to ensure they are reasonable and accurate. The first shot at categorizing should be up to project owners, but the OCIO should have oversight.

**Question:** What about activities that aren't projects, but are supporting the goals?

**Response:** The Committee is focusing on reportable projects this year.

## DGS Update

**Adrian Farley**

SB 954 contains language that the State must procure technology in a solution-based manner with risk assessments conducted throughout the process. DGS and DOF are working to develop criteria for conducting risk assessments for presentation to a joint budget committee by April 2008. They have developed a Statement of Work for inclusion in an RFP. The RFP is targeted for release in late October with contract award anticipated in January 2008. The criteria should be developed and returned to DGS by the end of March.

Strategic Sourcing RFPs for PC Goods were released August 19, 2007. Draft bids will be submitted by October 26, 2007. The RFP is consistent with the Governor's focus on environmental protection. CalEPA standards are central to ensure the goods measure up to the silver level.

The Strategic Sourcing RFP for PC Server are under development. Contract award is planned for June 2008. The current contract will be extended through June 2008.

DGS will be distributing a survey to gather feedback from participating agencies on how they can streamline and improve the strategic sourcing process. They hope to distribute the survey by the end of October.

## IT Awards Committee

**Davood Ghods**

The Committee continues to meet monthly. Wes Major, Chief Information Officer at Department of Finance, has joined the committee. Deborah Schwartz from BOE will be the committee vice-chair.

The Center for Digital Government 2007 Best of California Award nominations were due Oct 10, 2007. Over 150 nominations were submitted. The results will be announced in December.

Congratulations to DHS for their selection as a 2007 award winner by eC3 and to DCA for honorable mention by eC3. The awards will be presented at the eC3 annual conference in December.

NASCIO announced the winners of their [Recognition Awards for Outstanding Achievement in the Field of Information Technology](#). Nominations can be viewed on the NASCIO website by selecting the link to the award category.

### Security Committee

### John Lane and Colleen Pedroza

The Security Committee has completed three projects aligned with the IT Strategic Plan Goal 3 action items. The committee today presents for approval the [IT Security Program Guideline for State Agencies](#), the [Risk Assessment toolkit](#), and a [Guide for the Role and Responsibilities of an Information Security Officer Within State Government](#). The IT Security Program Guideline has been updated and enhanced. The Risk Assessment Toolkit, available on the website, provides a set of risk assessment tools based on the size and business of the organization as well as providing a strategy for choosing which tool is appropriate; standards for assessments will be added in the future. The proposed roles and responsibilities for ISO's in state government have been vetted within the ISO community. All three documents presented for adoption have been vetted through workgroups, subject matter experts, and posted on the [State Information Security Office](#) website for open comments. They will be posted on the website as final documents once adopted by the Council.

**Question:** Was the IT Security Program Guideline for State Agencies vetted through the IT Security Committee, ISO community, and Department of Finance?

**Response:** Yes

**Question:** Page 39 of the IT Security Program Guideline for State Agencies references minimal and incidental use for Internet access; do you anticipate changes in future documents?

**Response:** The reference is a sample policy; it has not been vetted through the unions. If a department chooses to implement the sample, they would need to vet it through the unions. The Committee is working with DPA to formalize this in a future, more directed policy that may eventually be adopted statewide.

**Action:** *A motion was made and seconded to adopt the IT Security Program Guideline for State Agencies; it was approved unanimously.*

**Question:** Why are some sections of the Guide for Roles and Responsibilities for a State ISO within State Government highlighted?

**Response:** Those sections were copied from the State Administrative Manual (SAM).

**Question:** How will the Guide for Roles and Responsibilities for a State ISO within State Government apply to departments that either don't have an independent ISO, but have assigned ISO responsibilities to a member of the IT staff? Only half of departments have a full time ISO today.



**Response:** The Committee heard from a lot of departments, especially small ones that are struggling with this issue. They tried to make the document scalable for department size. They are also asking departments without an ISO how best to approach the issue. It was noted that SAM specifically requires departments to have an ISO.

**Question:** The Guide for Roles and Responsibilities for a State ISO within State Government references both an ISO and a Privacy Officer. Do they need to be separate?

**Response:** In some cases, privacy officer duties are falling to the ISO. The Committee is not condoning this but is working with departments to ensure that it works smoothly.

**Action:** *A motion was made and seconded to approve and adopt the Guide for Roles and Responsibilities for a State ISO within State Government; it was approved unanimously.*

**Question:** Does the Risk Assessment Toolkit need ITC approval, since it will be a live, web active site?

**Response:** The Committee felt Council adoption would help advertise the site; they are not sure approval is needed.

**Comment:** The checklist was previously approved. Endorsement will be sufficient.

**Action:** *A motion was made and seconded to endorse the Risk Assessment Toolkit; it was approved unanimously.*

At the next meeting, the Committee plans to present for Council approval a general Internet usage policy and a policy on Continuity of Operations and Continuity of Government (COOP/COG).

## Security Committee: Protecting Consumers from Themselves

Joanne McNabb

The State Information Security Office (SISO) has developed a presentation targeted at consumers to provide information on how to protect themselves online. The presentation, [Protecting Consumers from Themselves](#), is available online. It provides information about keylogging, how keylogging software can be installed on your computer, how to avoid this, why this is an issue for state government, etc. It notes that when people with keylogging software installed on their computer visit a state site, the information they enter on the state site can be accessed by bad guys. US-CERT notified the SISO that there are systems outside state government accessing user information. They sent logs to the SISO; these logs were reviewed by the State Information Security Officer, the State Privacy Officer, and the California Highway Patrol (CHP). The logs don't identify who is accessing the information. It is very difficult, sometimes impossible, to figure out who has been impacted, so the State can't notify users. The SISO wanted to find a way to strategically educate consumers on how to protect themselves before they enter personal information. They are asking that state web pages where personal information is collected feature a prominent link to the presentation or similar information. They are considering making this a requirement in the future rather than a suggestion. The SISO will inform at-risk groups of the problem and provide information on how to best address the problem.

**Question:** Have you considered doing a public service announcement (PSA)?

**Response:** Yes, computer security would be one of the topics a PSA could address.

**Comment:** Sounds like a good idea; all departments have some level of responsibility to provide this type of information.

### IT Acquisitions Committee

**Christy Quinlan**

As noted in the DGS update earlier, the Committee has prepared a survey to capture both what works well and what doesn't work in the CSSI process as well as what improvements departments want to see. The survey will be sent to department CIO's and procurement officers.

The Committee has created a Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) subgroup. It was noted that RFID will be an add-on or optional solution for departments. Departments deploying RFID will need to purchase a reader/gun and software to load information into.

The Committee discussed at last month's meeting proposed language to DGS about compliance with DVBE/MBE/WBE. They are soliciting suggestions and comments; please send input to Christy Quinlan. There will be an opportunity to revise language in the new contract.

**Question:** Do we have specific goals for DVBE/MBE/WBE?

**Response:** Some departments are really focused on it. Vendors are required to show a good faith effort. The Committee talked about ways of determining how hard vendors tried to solicit that partnership; for example, they want to see more than one recruitment or publication. There are quotas or goals associated with it. Clark recommended members talk to their department's procurement section or organization.

### Technology Services Committee:

**Roy Simpson**

#### CA Internet Protocol Telephony (IP/TEL) Working Group

The presentation will be held over to the next meeting; the working group is being closed out.

### Technology Services Committee: Software as a Service    **John Ellison**

The Software as a Service (SaaS) Workgroup was formed to compare hosted email service offerings. They looked at DTS, Google Apps Premier Edition, and MS Office Live Preview. Microsoft has released Exchange Online in the last few weeks; it is not included in the study. The [Software as a Service: Messaging and Calendaring Presentation](#) available on the CIO website provides additional detail. The Workgroup noted they were unable to evaluate Google App's GoogleGears functionality (providing the ability to work offline) because it is not yet available. During the initial part of the evaluation, Google partnered with Postini; they will offer that functionality as part of their service bundle. Colorado and Michigan are considering GoogleApps. It was noted that the costs quoted in the study are list price; actual government prices would likely be lower. The Workgroup recommends that the state consider some pilots that can start gathering information and metrics. If the decision is made that California should have a single common email solution, the Workgroup recommends forming an ITC workgroup to formulate the technical requirements.



## ITC Meeting Minutes

October 19, 2007

**Comment:** The IT Council should look into having DGS investigate procuring Software as a Service. Currently there is a lack of standardized terms and conditions across the enterprise for SaaS purchases.

**Comment:** The recognition that email is a commodity is supported by the evaluation; this validates the ITC's recognition a couple years ago that the state should start moving toward commoditizing email through a central offering at DTS rather than departments maintaining their own.

**Comment:** It would be interesting to see the difference of experience of Proctor and Gambol versus a university setting. California is more similar to a corporation than a university. It is unclear if web-based applications have the same richness of delegation as traditional applications or if we need the current level of delegation.

**Comment:** Down the road, it would be beneficial for us if there were meaningful migration strategies to allow us to better manage our email separate from but related to document management.

**Comment:** The Technology Services Committee within the Technology Services Board (TSB) has a Statewide Email Subcommittee; it would be beneficial for this Workgroup to present the report to that Subcommittee.

## Enterprise Architecture & Standards Committee

**Ellen Ishimoto**

The Committee has drafted the California Business Reference Model, leveraging the model created by the federal government to meet California's needs. It is being vetted through Committee members. Clark has asked the Undersecretaries to provide comments on the draft and to have their organizations identify, at a department level, which business functions they are actually participating in. The model will provide an organizational view of business functions. The Committee is in the process of compiling this view. The BRM will be posted on the CIO website for review. The Committee will also put together a one-page overview providing the history and purpose of the model.

The first EA Peer Group meeting was held several months ago. The October meeting will be deferred to November. Information will be sent to interested parties.

The Committee will be cosponsoring an event for enterprise architecture vendors to share what is going on in the state; the event will be scheduled later this year or early next year.

Representatives from FTB, EDD, CalPERS, DMV, and DOT have joined the Committee.

## EA & Standards Committee: Identity Management

**Lee Macklin**

No update due to time constraints.

## Human Resources Committee

**Debra Gonzales**

The Classification team concluded the validation process for the IT Specialist series. They are expecting preliminary findings next week. Technologist and manager classes are three-quarters complete. The Telecom Specialist classification was pulled out as a separate series. A working group is being formed to conduct a baseline survey on

telecom classifications in the State. IT procurement specialists will be looked at separately.

Cohorts 3 and 4 of the leadership program are graduating today. Three new cohorts will be starting soon. The Leadership for Government Executives Advisory Committee is meeting today; they will discuss the development of programs for supervisors and managers.

### Telecom Strategic Plan

**Gary Arstein-Kerslake**

The [Draft Telecom Strategic Plan](#) was originally presented at the April 2007 ITC meeting. The draft plan is available and was discussed at the July 19<sup>th</sup> ITC Meeting. The Committee has received some input over the past 30-60 days and has incorporated the changes. The Committee is presenting the plan today for adoption.

**Comment:** There is some alignment with activities at DTS and concern that DTS may not be able to complete all their action items within the timeframes. DTS will be contracting with a consultant in the next 30 days to conduct additional analysis of the technology from a business perspective. The Committee may want to blend the action items with the resulting consultant recommendations.

**Question:** How did the committee determine who was assigned action items and the timeframes to complete?

**Response:** The Committee considered that action items as a whole should be able to be completed within a 12-24 month timeframe. Many of the activities have a limited scope and some activities are already well underway. The workgroup is fully cognizant of the fact that these are not funded activities; determining the actual scope of effort is deferred to the assigned organization. The scope of activities should reflect what can reasonably be accomplished in a 12-24 month period with no special funding. If an assignment places an undue burden on the assignee, they can also consider options such as completing it in partnership with another department or a working group.

**Comment:** There are some concerns about which departments were assigned activities, are these departments aware of the assignments, and are they willing to take them on. Assignments should fit with the assigned department's area of expertise and workload. We don't want to publish a plan that we can't implement.

**Response:** The assignment of the action items was done based on the existing statutory responsibilities and business activities of the identified agencies. For example, items which related to "CSGNet-type" services would logically fall within DTS; items with an "emergency services" components would typically involve OES; items relating to security policy would presumably involve the State's ISO office, etc. If it is discovered during the initial efforts to undertake an action item that some organizations should be added and others removed, that is at the discretion of the agencies involved.

**Comment:** There should be more discussion on the recommended direction with more justification than "industry best standard". There is also concern about the governance piece. We have a pretty robust governance process in place today; the plan appears to be trying to set up a separate governance structure for Telecom. If we're going to have separate governance structures in place, where are the lines drawn?

The gap analysis information from DTS would be wonderful information to blend into the report in the future. There is concern about policy implications; this could result in de facto policies being set or setting direction for future policies and may not provide for adequate review and vetting. There is concern about including local government in this strategic plan as a broad statement without knowing if local government wants to be involved. The commenter would be reluctant to support the strategic plan today based on these concerns.

**Response:** Most of the goals are high-level business goals. The exception is convergence which is already occurring due to technological changes. Network convergence is a fundamental technical and business process that will continue throughout the public and private sector regardless of whether or not the State establishes “policy” related to it. The Committee doesn’t assume endorsement of convergence for any specific project, but more as a general direction. Gap analysis information from DTS will undoubtedly have value, especially for DTS in their planning efforts related to CSGNet and any subsequent state network. But, the scope of “telecommunications” here is broader than the service offerings available from the data center. There have been a number of prior “strategic plans” targeted toward specific areas of telecommunications, such as the former DGS Telecomm division strategic plan, the strategic directions implied in the CalNet contract, the Data Center plans related to CSGNet, etc. The definition of telecommunications for this plan is deliberately very broad and the business goals high-level in order to more broadly cover the field of “telecommunications”.

Regarding governance, the proposals outlined in the strategic plan are intended to fit within the existing governance structure. The telecom definition was intentionally broad; the Committee didn’t want to consider telecom as beginning and ending at the demarcation point where it enters a building. Telecom is much more complex than that and should more broadly be considered the transport of information.

Regarding local government’s role, this recognizes that local governments are important business partners with the State and actually use a greater volume of services from the CalNet contract than the State agencies do. The role of local government was defined based on the assumption that, where there are shared services, it is in our best interest to work together. Network issues and CalNet as a telecom vehicle are very important to local government. State and local government are both part of an intergovernmental network and through the current ITC local government representatives, their input and participation was solicited and incorporated. For additional information contact: Stephen Monaghan, Chief Information Officer, Nevada County, or Satish Ajmani, Chief Information Officer, Orange County, or Laura Peabody, Chief Information Officer, City of Walnut Creek, or Greg Park, Chief Information Officer, City of Livermore.

**Comment:** The governance section doesn’t refer to the Enterprise Leadership Council (ELC). If telecom is an enterprise business for the state, there should be some role for the ELC in any governance structure.

**Response:** There may be a role for the ELC. The document assigns responsibility for establishing the Telecom governance structure to the State CIO assisted by the IT Council. Decisions need to be made regarding what input DTS gets from the business side in deciding what services should be available. This may include the ELC.

## ITC Meeting Minutes

October 19, 2007

***Action: A motion was made and seconded to adopt the Telecom Strategic Plan. The issue was raised again that some agencies identified in the plan with responsibility for certain action items may want to suggest revised completion dates for the action items. To address this concern, the State CIO indicated he would consult with the directors of these agencies and any minor date revisions could be made prior to publication of the report. In the unlikely event that significant changes were requested to task assignments or timeframes, the plan will return to the IT Council for consideration. The motion to adopt the Telecom Strategic Plan was approved with one vote against it.***

## Policy Committee

Lee Kercher

No update due to time constraints.

## Policy Committee: Green IT Work Group

Shell Culp

The presentation, [Green IT Operations Workgroup](#), is available on the CIO website. The working group is not focused on any single data center type, but rather on how we can change our behavior to reduce our environmental impact. The team is being formed and will have representation from state government, local government, and the education sector. The first meeting is targeted for the second week of November at the CalEPA building. The working group has been directed to develop a blueprint for green IT operations. They plan to accomplish this through symposia and toolkits. California has an opportunity to provide leadership in this area. Departments interested in participating should contact [Shell Culp](#).

## IT Leaders Questions and Issues

All

No questions.

## Closing

Clark Kelso

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.